

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-46 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 12, and 14-35 have been amended. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the Specification, for example, at paragraphs 0032, 0084, and 0088. No claims have been added. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-46 are present for examination. Claims 1, 22, and 35 are independent claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection, Moore, Jr. et al. in view of Bhogal et al.

Claims 1-8, 12, 17, 21-25, 27, 32, 35-37, 39, and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,035,270 to Moore, Jr. et al. (“Moore”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,248,563 to Bhogal et al. (“Bhogal”).

Applicants submit that Moore discloses “an interface between an HFC network and an in-home network.” (*See* Moore at Abstract.) Moore further discloses that the interface includes “[a] processor, a non-volatile memory and RAM.” (*See* col. 4, lines 8-9 and Fig. 2.) Furthermore, Moore discloses that the interface which includes a processor and that the processor has the “ability to convert the in-home networking protocol-related information to HFC network parameters.” (*See* Moore at col. 5, line 17-19).

Bhogal discloses “[a] system... for restricting access to a network using a network communications device. The network communications device includes multiple ports for providing access to a data processing system to the network.” (Bhogal at Abstract.) In contrast, claim 1, and similarly claims 22, and 35 recite that “the plurality of microservers are *plug-and-play combatable* such that any of the plurality of microservers are configured to be able to be *added and/or removed from the network interface device at any time and without configuration*” and that “the plurality of microservers are *integrated in the network interface device*.” (Emphasis provided.) Applicants are unable to find any disclosure in either Moore or Bhogal of

such plug-and-play microservers integrated into a network interface device. In other words, the microservers may be added and/or removed from the network interface device easily and without having to restart, configure, or power-down the network interface device. Accordingly, a subscriber using the network interface device and receiving service from a service provider could add and/or remove services implemented in the network interface device by the microservers without interrupting server and without the technician entering the interior of the customer's home. The technician simply accesses the network interface device from the home's exterior and swaps out the appropriate plug and play microserver(s). In addition, maintenance and repair of the network interface device can similarly be performed by the technician.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 and similarly claims 22 and 35 are patentable over Moore and Bhogal, individually or when combined in any combination. Furthermore, claims 2-21, 23-34 and 36-46 depend from independent claims 1, 22, and 35, respectively. Thus, by virtue of their dependence on an allowable independent claim, Applicants submit that claims 2-21, 23-34 and 36-46 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 26, 28, 30, 33-34, 38, 40, 42, and 45-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore and Bhogal in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,127 to Rakib ("Rakib").

Claims 14, 29 and 41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore and Bhogal in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,694,616 to Johnson ("Johnson").

Claims 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 26, 28-30, 33-34, 38, 40-42, 45, and 46 depend from one of independent claims 1, 22, and 35. Thus, by virtue of their dependence on an allowable independent claim, Applicants submit that claims 9-11, 13-16, 18-20, 26, 28-30, 33-34, 38, 40-42, 45, and 46 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/624,454
Amdt. dated October 24, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 24, 2008

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. Applicants do not acquiesce to any argument not specifically addressed herein. Rather, Applicants believe the amendments and arguments contained herein overcome all rejections presented.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Gray
Reg. No. 61,345



TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
CWG:slb
61576436 v1